



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR    | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/081,095      | 02/22/2002  | David Allen Loewenstein |                     | 2840             |

7590

02/18/2004

David A. Loewenstein  
802 King Street  
Rye Brook, NY 10573

EXAMINER

COLLINS, DOLORES R

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

3722

15

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

10/081,095

Applicant(s)

LOEWENSTEIN, DAVID ALLEN

Examiner

Dolores R. Collins

Art Unit

3722

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 16 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.


3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.Claim(s) objected to: NONE.Claim(s) rejected: 1-5, 13 and 18-29.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

  
A. L. WELLINGTON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Continuation of 10. Other:

Applicant has amended the claims, rejected under USC 112 paragraphs one and two, in order to overcome those rejections. The proposed amendment will be entered, however, outlined below is a summary of how the claims would be rejected.

1. Claim 1 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Silliman, Jr. Silliman, Jr. discloses Playing Cards And Games. His cards teach a value on one side and suit and value on the other.
2. Claim 2 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silliman, Jr. in view of Hoyt et al.
3. Claims 3-5 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silliman, Jr. in view of Stanton and further in view of Hoyt et al.
4. Regarding claims 3-5 & 25  
Silliman, Jr. discloses Playing Cards And Games. His cards teach a value on one side and suit and value on the other, but fail to explicitly teach that his cards are dealt in the shape of a diamond.  
Stanton discloses Improvements in and relating to Playing cards. Stanton teaches cards with indicia arranged into four suits on one side and values on the other side (page 1, lines 14-24 & figures 1-4).
5. Claim 13 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silliman, Jr.
6. Claim 18 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silliman, Jr. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Moody.
7. Claim 19 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being method that is well known in the art.
8. Claim 20 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being well known in the art.
9. Claim 21 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being a mere issue of intended use.
10. Claims 22-24 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silliman, Jr. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Hoyt and Moody.
11. Claim 25 will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being well known in the art.

Indication of Allowable Subject Matter is hereby withdrawn since upon rereview the claims can be overcome.